Norstad Thinks Limited War Unlikely, P. 3

Cheering Bulletin: Surprise Maneuver Forces Vote in House on Nuclear Give-Away, See Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 30 AUGUST 3, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

On Various Kinds of Captivity Among Nations

The resemblances are more striking than the differences in the Nixon visit with Khrushchev. Both men are opportunists. The Red-baiter of 1948 now preaches co-existence in Moscow while Stalin's hatchet-man for the Ukraine blossoms out as a liberalizer. They signal a welcome change of climate on both sides. Both are shrewd, not too cultured, organization men. For Nixon, color television—judging by how often he stressed it—seems to be the apogee of American civilization, but we may be sure that when the Russians get color TV, too, they will acclaim it as the full flower of Marxism-Leninism. These are the spokesmen for two mass production civilizations geared to the common man. In both countries vast political machines conflict with the idealized images, here of democracy, there of Communism, and regard non-conformists with suspicion. The last-minute removal of suspect books from the U. S. fair in Moscow demonstrates the phobia which characterizes a debased socialism, but Nixon—who climbed to power as comrade-in-arms of Mundt and Walter—is no Jeffersonian either. The Russians complain of our Captive Nations Week, but like us have long taught their people that the other side holds millions in captivity, waiting to be liberated. The H-bomb fortunately promises to be too liberating, and so they have begun to talk, though still belligerently, and are in process of discovering with surprise that the other is human. This is all to the good, for the two most captive nations on earth are ours, captives of a mutual fear which spells mutual destruction unless dissipated.

When It's Civil Rights for Eastern Europe

Mr. Walter Lippmann's thoughtful column July 28 on Nixon in Russia gives the impression that our Captive Nations Week resolution originated with "that notorious lover of liberty, Mr. Eastland." The fact is that it was introduced by Douglas and Javits. The former thanked Eastland "for his courteous assistance in securing prompt consideration" by the Senate Judiciary Committee which reported it out with a celerity rarely shown in dealing with measures which seek to liberate another oppressed people closer to Mr. Eastland's native Mississippi. The co-sponsors included liberals acting irresponsibly and rightists who think war inevitable.* Most of them were, of course, playing to the voters of East European origin in their home states, and the resolution passed July 6 without discussion as a cynical gesture. But some of the sponsors must blush to think that Douglas said action "prior to the resumption" of the Geneva talks was urgent because it would "strengthen the hand" of our negotiators.

Presumably the resolution was meant to encourage the victims of Communist expansion since 1918 but its list of countries to be liberated includes areas acquired by the Russians long before communism. The resolution names the Ukraine, which the Russians annexed more than 300 years ago, White Ruthenia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Idel-Ural (whatever that it is), "Cossackia" and Turkestan. Were the Russians to pass a similar Captive Nations resolution aimed at us, they would propose to give California back to Mexico, Louisiana Territory to France, Florida to Spain and Roanoke Island to the descendants of Pocahontas, leaving us a generous area around the District of Columbia. The listing betrays the hands of certain fanatical Ukrainian nationalists under Jesuit patronage here who have long insisted that our enemy is not Communism but Muscovy. Just to strengthen further the hand of our negotiators at Geneva, they threw into their list "mainland China" and Tibet. Were Khrushchev to free all these territories, and allow Cardinal Spellman to baptize him, these Ukrainians would be prepared to negotiate.

The German Captivity Was Worse

Those really interested in lightening the Russian hold on such countries as Poland and Hungary are invited to notice an instructive coincidence. Majority Leader McCormack put the Captive Nations resolution through the House on July 9 just before the hour allotted Congressman Meyer of Vermont and a half a dozen others to make a forlorn stand against the agreements to give nuclear training and nuclear weapons to the Germans and other allies. The press galleries emptied after the oratory over Captive Nations Week and few stayed on to hear the nuclear pacts questioned, though they affect East Europe. If the West Germans are to have nuclear arms, the Russians will be forced either to give nuclear weapons to the satellite armies or to establish strong nuclear bases of their own in the satellite states. In either case this will spell tighter political control, a deeper captivity for those Captive Nations. In the Senate, Humphrey similarly prefaced his weak and equivocal remarks about the nuclear pacts on July 17 with a demogogic speech on "Kozlov's Visit and the Captive Nation." An atom free Central and Eastern Europe would be the first step toward milder regimes in the area. But the Germans want nuclear arms to extend their own power again into East Europe, and our foreign policy has long been geared not to a freer East Europe but to a stronger Germany. Who bothers to remember that these "captive nations" were all too recently the victims of a captivity worse than Russian control, with all the Slavic peoples treated as sub-human?

*The co-sponsors were Moss (D. Utah), Bush (R. Conn.), Lausche (D. Ohio), Scott (R. Pa.), Hartke (D. Ind.), Green (D. R. I.), Dodd (D. Conn.), Humphrey (D. Minn.), Hart (D. Mich.), Neuberger (D. Ore.), Keating (R. N. Y.), Young (R. N. D.), Engle (D. Cal.), Curtis (R. Neb.), Langer (R. N. D.), Morse (D. Ore.) and Case (R. N. J.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New McCarthy Speaks Up Against Non-Communist Affidavits As the McCarthyism Ebbs

Close Senate Vote on Student Loyalty Oaths Shows Witch Hunt Dying

The non-Communist affidavit in the National Defense Education Act escaped repeal by a narrow margin in the U. S. Senate after a two day debate July 23. The Senate by a vote of 46-45 had actually approved a Javits compromise substituting an oath of allegiance. But then, on motion by Long (La.), the Senate voted 49-42 to recommit, killing the possibility of action this session.

Three Democrats (Hartke of Indiana, Hayden of Arizona, and Sparkman of Alabama) and two Republicans (Langer of North Dakota and Scott of Pennsylvania) switched their votes to make this outcome possible: they were recorded for the Javits compromise but then voted to recommit. (The discrepancy in the totals arises because Kefauver—absent in the vote on the Javits compromise—turned up to vote against the motion to recommit while Chavez of New Mexico voted against the Javits motion but was absent from the later vote.)

The close vote should encourage educators and students to plan now for a bigger campaign next year to eliminate the non-Communist affidavit not only from the 1958 Act but from the older National Science Foundation scholarships. Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the powerful Bureau of the Budget supported repeal both of the non-Communist affidavit and the special oath of allegiance required for scholarships under the 1958 act.

Now A Geological Problem

"I am not willing to accept the idea that there are no Communists left in this country. I think that if we lift enough rocks, we will find some."

—Goldwater (R. Ariz) in Senate debate July 23.

Despite Administration support only eight Republicans: Aiken (*Vt.*), Bush (*Conn.*), Case (*N. J.*), Cooper (*Ky.*), Javits (*N. Y.*), Keating (*N. Y.*), Kuchel (*Cal.*) and Saltonstall (*Mass.*) voted against the motion to recommit. So did five liberal Southerners—Fulbright (*Ark.*), Hill (*Ala.*), Yarborough (*Tex.*), and Gore and Kefauver (*Tenn.*). They broke away from the Bourbon coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats which put over the motion to recommit. The three big Ivy League colleges opposed the loyalty oath, swinging the Senators from their States with the exception of Connecticut's Dodd who was ill and unrecorded. Williams and Case of New Jersey, Bush of Connecticut and Saltonstall of Massachusetts voted for the Javits compromise.

Why Not Add to the Student Oath 'And I Solemnly Swear Not to Support Castro'?

"The aggressive onward march of atheistic communism has now reached Cuba, 90 miles from the United States. . . . Is that any reason for us to burn down the jail and shoot the policeman and say, 'We are not going to be as tough on communism as we were a year ago, when we enacted the Nat'l Defense Education Act'?"

—Mundt (R. S. D.) opposing oath repeal, July 23.

Little Courage in That Profile

Kennedy, though co-sponsor of the original bill with Clark of Pennsylvania, seemed strikingly lukewarm about his own measure, opened the debate by offering the same compromise as Javits and said little in defense of his bill until the last few minutes of debate. His profile still exhibits as little courage as it did in McCarthy's heyday; he had to be against the non-Communist affidavit in view of Harvard's attitude and Saltonstall's but let his co-sponsor, Clark, carry the fight. There is a satisfying symbolism in the fact that the best speech for repeal of the non-Communist affidavit was made by a McCarthy, but this time young Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota, a freshman Democratic liberal and himself a sociology professor and an "egg head."

Four other freshmen Democrats, Williams (*N. J.*), Young (*Ohio*), Church (*Idaho*) and McGee (*Wyo.*) spoke up strongly against educational test oaths, the last named as a former president of the American Association of University Presidents. John Sherman Cooper (*R. Ky.*), who has shown more devotion to civil liberties than any other member of the Senate, was the one eloquent voice on the Republican side, asking whether behind the loyalty oath was a fundamental distrust of "the search for ideas and the search for truth."

Clark at one point challenged Mundt to join him in sponsoring an amendment to subject all recipients of government loans or bounties—including farmers—to loyalty oath provisions. Mundt backed down. It was disappointing that no proponents of repeal talked of the general atmosphere which inhibits students today from talking as freely and "joining" as freely as in the 30's, or showed how these loyalty oaths are mechanism of thought control. The right, nevertheless, *was* on the defense, and the academic community—if it starts now—has a good chance of winning next year.

Legal Subtleties (Before-or-After Problems) of the Hunt for Subversive Students

Sen. PROUTY (R. Vt.) Suppose I took the oath of allegiance tomorrow, but later found that I might have been engaged in subversive activities. How could I prove that at the time I took the oath, I was not a subversive?

Sen. PASTORE (D. R. I.). No matter what was done, the thing which counts occurs at the time of the taking of the money. When a person takes the money, he must prove his allegiance to the United States. That is controlling. . . .

Sen. HOLLAND (D. Fla.). Mr. President, I dislike to disagree completely with the Senator from Rhode Island but . . . the crime of perjury is committed, if it is committed at all, when the oath is taken. The oath of allegiance which is contained in the so-called Javits amendment might be violated by a perjurer who is a Communist at the time he took the oath. But if he was not such at the time he took the oath, and then during the four-year course of his education he went ahead and decided to become a Communist or a subversive . . . the Mundt amendment would cover the acceptance of any money at any time during the course of the operation, whereas the oath of loyalty would not. . . .

Sen. PASTORE. The idea that if he takes the oath of allegiance today, and if tomorrow he decides to join a Communist group, he then will be free to accept the money, is a rather far-fetched notion. . . .

Sen. HOLLAND. The only way . . . would be to require —although the law does not require it—that the student renew the oath every time he receives an additional check.

—Debate, U. S. Senate July 23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Undercuts Argument Nuclear Arms Necessary Against "Red Hordes"

Norstad Figures Disclose NATO Armed Forces Larger Than Warsaw Pact's

Newly released testimony by NATO Commander Gen. Lauris Norstad undercuts two of the favorite arguments used by the State and Defense Departments for spreading nuclear arms to our NATO allies.

One is that the NATO countries need nuclear weapons to deal with "the overwhelming numerical superiority of Soviet forces." The other is that nuclear weapons will enable our NATO allies to resist Soviet aggression short of all-out war.

The Norstad testimony begins at page 793 of the hearings on the 1960 Mutual Security Budget which the House Appropriations Committee released on July 23. General Norstad explained (p. 814) that our military assistance program was helping to finance 3,500,000 men under arms in NATO, "exclusive of the U. S. and Canadian armed forces." As against this, he estimated the Russian armed forces at 4,000,000 to 4,500,000 men.

U. S. and Canadian armed forces total better than 2,500,000. Added to the 3,500,000 figure above, this brings the total NATO forces to 6,000,000 men. Russia's seven European satellite states in the Warsaw Pact have among them about 1,000,000 men under arms. This brings the Warsaw Pact total, if we use Norstad's top estimate of Russian strength, to 4,500,000 men. So this is how the two sides stack up:

NATO Pact Armed Forces	**6,000,000 men**
Warsaw Pact Powers	**5,500,000 men**
Western Advantage	**500,000 men**

These figures do not fit the nightmarish propaganda picture of the West confronted by overwhelming Soviet "hordes." The fact is that the Atlantic Alliance, in addition to controlling most of the world's wealth and productive capacity, has a total population of more than 400,000,000, or twice that of the Soviet Union alone, and 50 percent more than the 300,000,000 of the U. S. S. R. and its European satellites combined.

With this manpower and these resources, the Atlantic Pact powers are quite capable of holding their own in Europe with conventional arms. They may not get as many divisions out of their manpower but this is because they use up resources on lavish equipment and supply.

Pentagon Official Thinks "Baby Bombs" Can Make Berlin A Baby Dispute

But NATO Commander Doesn't Believe Nuclear War Can Be Limited

We now come to the second argument advanced by the State Department for spreading nuclear arms to NATO. In the Department statement made public by Senator Fulbright July 17, it was argued that nuclear arms would make NATO's defense more "balanced and flexible."

The statement said, "As General Norstad has pointed out, the shield forces, in addition to constituting an essential element of the deterrent to general war" would also—if equipped with nuclear arms — be able to prevent "less than general war," provide added means for dealing with "localized aggression" and compel an aggressor to "pause and make a conscious decision whether to cease and desist, or whether to persist in aggressive action, thereby bringing into play the Western retaliatory force."

Norstad Differs With Pentagon

This may reflect dominant Pentagon thinking but it gives a false impression of General Norstad's views. The dominant Pentagon view seems to have been expressed by Major Gen. John S. Guthrie, Director, European Region, Office of the Assistant Secretary of State for International Security Affairs, when he was questioned on this point by Senator Church (D. Idaho) before Senate Foreign Relations last May 7.*

General Guthrie said the original NATO plans, as formulated at Lisbon in 1952, called for defense by conventional armies but that in 1954 "all the NATO countries agreed that the tactical atomic weapons had arrived, the smaller weapon, the so-called baby bombs . . . so that it [i.e., atomic war] was not necessarily going to result in complete devastation for some local country." So, he said, we need no longer rely on "all-or-nothing" operations "if, for example, the Russians closed in on Berlin and occupied it."

So here we have the idea that with "baby bombs" the NATO powers could hold off the Russians in limited nuclear war and force them to "pause and make a conscious decision whether to cease and desist" [as if in response to a Federal Trade Commission order!—IFS].

General Norstad was scornful of this view when he was before the House Appropriations Committee in executive session June 8. Congressman Gary (D. Va.) asked him, "could you not have a limited war and still use atomic weapons? If you started out to drop bombs immediately on Moscow and on all strategic points in Russia, you would have an all-out war, but could you not use the battlefield weapons with atomic warheads on battlefield operations?"

General Norstad did not think that military action, once begun in so critical an area as NATO's, especially with atomic weapons, could be broken off. He did not think the forces "could easily disengage as if it were a baseball game and say, 'we will play it tomorrow afternoon if it is not raining'."

"I do not agree," General Norstad said, "with those people who say that you can control the size of this fire, the size of this blast, neatly cold-bloodedly, once it starts. I think it is the most dangerous and disastrous thing in the world. I think you must prevent the thing from starting in the first place because once it starts in a critical area such as the NATO area, it is more likely than not, in my opinion, to explode into the whole thing, whether we like it or the Russians like it or anybody likes it."

General Norstad did not think the Russians would start World War III but saw "a very great danger of our maneuvering ourselves into a position where we might very well become involved in a war as a result of an error or mistake in judgment." The errors will not become less dangerous when more countries have nuclear arms with which to make them.

***See that committee's hearings on the Mutual Security Act *of 1959, part I, p. 297.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Despite Press Blackout, Third of Those Present Vote "No" on Atomic Arms

House Insurgents by Surprise Maneuver Force Vote on Nuclear Give-Away

In an unexpected last-ditch battle, a small valiant group in the House last Tuesday forced a vote on the nuclear give-away agreements by an amendment to the foreign aid bill. The amendment, submitted for the group by Bennett (*D. Fla.*), would have forbidden the use of foreign aid funds to finance the nuclear training or nuclear equipment of allied armies under the new agreements. All of these agreements, except that with Greece, had become law by midnight July 26 without a vote since the Rules committee had refused to report out any of the resolutions seeking to veto them.

Taber (*R. N. Y.*), ranking Republican on House Appropriations, tried to raise a point of order. Durham (*D. N. C.*), ranking Democrat on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, threw his prestige against the amendment, telling the House that the nuclear armament of the West Germans and other NATO allies "is not a matter which can be fully discussed in open session."

Only Four Percent Voted "No" Last Year

Despite this invocation of military hush-hush, almost one-third of those present voted for the amendment and against the nuclear give-away. The vote was 137 to 61. It was not a roll-call. Two Republicans and 59 Democrats (about half the Democrats on the floor) voted against the financing of nuclear armament. This shows a rising tide of concern. Last year, on a roll-call vote, on the Atomic Energy Act amendments first authorizing these agreements, the opposition was snowed under 345 to 12. The vote against the nuclear give-away was less than four percent last year; it was better than 30 percent this year.

The procedure adopted by the insurgents in the House could also be used in the Senate where no one had the nerve to introduce a resolution. Humphrey threw in the sponge on the fight with a weak speech July 17 which ended by approving the pending agreements, including that for the nuclear rearmament of Germany.

But there seems to have been an extraordinary outpouring of letters from all over the county despite a pretty complete press blackout. (The *New York Times,* unlike the *Washington Post* and the *Baltimore Sun* did not even mention the vote on the anti-nuclear give-away amendment).

An index of popular pressure was the changed attitude of Senator Javits. Earlier he brusquely told a delegation from the New York Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy that it did not know what it was talking about. On Friday July 24, however, Javits rose in the Senate to say that "thousands" of his constituents had written him about the agreements.

On the one hand, Javits said he had come to the conclusion that the agreements would strengthen "our military defense posture." On the other hand, he sympathized with the concern expressed and promised "the most scrupulous attention" to future developments. "I pledge myself," he said, "to act as a vigilant sentinel" and added that Senator Humphrey "who has analyzed this subject very carefully, takes pretty much the same position that I do." The position seems to be that of viligant sentinels over a barn from which the horse has already been stolen. They could still do what the insurgents did in the House, when the foreign aid bill reaches the Senate. The Senate may not vote on it until the end of August.

A Freshman Vote Led by Meyer

A group of freshmen in the House, as yet unbroken by its steamroller leadership, deserve the credit for forcing the only vote so far this session on a step so momentous as the nuclear rearmament of Germany. Meyer of Vermont was ably seconded by Johnson of Colorado, Clem Miller of California, Wolf of Iowa. Old-timers like Wier of Minnesota and the eloquent Mrs. Edith Green of Oregon (she called it a "share-the-doom" program) joined in, as did the war hero and air ace McGovern of South Dakota and (a new recruit in Tuesday's debate)Kowalski of Connecticut, a West Pointer and regular Army man, who said all Poles—Communist or not —share a common fear of a resurgent Germany armed with nuclear weapons.

Florida's Bennett was one of a small number of Southern Democrats who voted against the give-away last year. He emphasized that today's allies may easily become tomorrow's enemies and added, "A fanatically anti-Communist ally can use weapons developed with these secrets to bring about a war which we are attempting to avoid."

Extra Copies Recent Issues Available for Circulation in Fight Against Nuclear Give-Away

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

8/3/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED